Page 1

```
1
       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
       FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
       CHARLOTTE DIVISION
                                      3:20-CV-00504-FDW-DSC
 3
 4
       CPI SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
 5
              Plaintiff and
 6
              Counterclaim Defendant,
 7
            vs.
       VIVINT SMART HOME, INC.
 8
       f/k/a MOSAIC ACQUISITION
       CORP.; LEGACY VIVINT SMART
 9
       HOME, INC. f/k/a VIVINT SMART
10
       HOME, INC.,
11
             Defendants and
              Counterclaimants.
12
13
14
15
         VIDEOTAPED VIRTUAL ZOOM 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION OF
           CPI SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC. BY JOHN SHOCKNESSE
16
               (Taken by Defendants/Counterclaimants)
17
                     Charlotte, North Carolina
18
                   Thursday, September 23, 2021
19
20
21
22
23
       Reported by Andrea L. Kingsley, RPR
24
25
       Job No. CS4810616
```

CPI and number of different actions taken as a result of that controversy; right?

- A. I don't know if there were any charity donations based off that, we were already donating to most of the charities that we were already involved in. We probably did a much better job advertising that we did. I would say that was a problem for us, we didn't let employees and customers know as well how active we were within the community.
- Q. So then your understanding is CPI didn't make any charitable donations directly as a result of the controversy then, it was already planning to make in the ordinary course of business?
- A. Certainty it's outside my area of expertise but I'm not aware of any.
- Q. You would agree with me, wouldn't you, that that controversy that erupted did some damage to CPI's reputation in the community?

MR. HOBBS: Objection to the form.

You can answer.

- A. It was difficult.
- Q. You're not going to dispute since I say that that resulted in damage to CPI's reputation and goodwill; right?

MR. HOBBS: Same objection. Also outside the scope. I believe I have a standing objection on that. So you can answer.

2.2

2.5

- A. I mean I guess -- I guess the way I would perceive it is that it went way, way longer than the news story typically would have because it was being used, put in front of people's faces even though it wasn't in the news anymore. So well after the time it was in the news, it was still being displayed.
- Q. I understand what you're saying, but regardless of whether you think it was justified or not, the fact is that that caused some damage to CPI's reputation which CPI took some actions attempting to repair that you testified about earlier; right?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ HOBBS: Objection to the form. You can answer.

A. I guess that I would say that it was an e-mail that was taken out of context that was used against Mr. Gill that was then later, the situation was taken out of context and used against CPI. So you know, my opinion is that it was an e-mail that was sent that was absolutely mischaracterized in

what the goal was as far as message. And then it was misused.

Q. That wasn't my question. My question was -- this is a simple yes or no question. Do you deny that that controversy did at least some damage to CPI's reputation in the community?

MR. HOBBS: Same objection. You can answer.

O. Yes or no?

2.2

- A. I don't deny there was some damage.
- Q. I think we established earlier and confirmed, as far as you know, CPI has not undertaken to quantify the precise amount, monetary amount of any damage to its reputation resulting from that controversy; right?

MR. HOBBS: Same objections.

- Q. To your knowledge?
- A. If we have, I'm not involved with it.

 It's not normally something I would be involved in.

 So.
- Q. Going back to -- take a look at the last sentence of paragraph 1 there, the last two lines of that paragraph, you see that it alleges there that some of this conduct by Vivint has resulted in CPI customers entering into a contract with Vivint and,